# COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH OVERSIGHT DIVISION

#### **FISCAL NOTE**

<u>L.R. No.</u>: 1986-01 <u>Bill No.</u>: HB 834

Subject: Disabilities; Agriculture and Animals

Type: Original Date: April 8, 2013

Bill Summary: This proposal revises the definition of service dog to include animals that

provide support or therapeutic functions for individuals with psychiatric or

mental disabilities.

# FISCAL SUMMARY

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	
Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue				
Fund	\$0	<b>\$0</b>	\$0	

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>Other</u> State Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0	

Numbers within parentheses: ( ) indicate costs or losses.

This fiscal note contains 5 pages.

L.R. No. 1986-01 Bill No. HB 834 Page 2 of 5 April 8, 2013

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u>				
Federal Funds	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE)					
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2014 FY 2015 FY 201				
Total Estimated Net Effect on FTE	0	0	0		

- ☐ Estimated Total Net Effect on All funds expected to exceed \$100,000 savings or (cost).
- □ Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue Fund expected to exceed \$100,000 (cost).

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	
<b>Local Government</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	

L.R. No. 1986-01 Bill No. HB 834 Page 3 of 5 April 8, 2013

#### FISCAL ANALYSIS

#### **ASSUMPTION**

§§ 209.150, 209.152, and 209.200 - Service dogs for persons with mental disabilities:

In response to similar legislation from 2013 (SB 33), officials at the **Department of Mental Health (DMH)** stated this proposal would provide every person with a visual, aural, or other disability the same rights afforded to a person with no such disability to the full and free use of the streets, highways, sidewalks, walkways, public buildings, public facilities, and other public places as well as other accommodations.

DMH assumed the proposal addresses issues related to trainers of service dogs, search and rescue dogs, etc. – giving them the right to be accompanied by dogs that are being trained. It further defines certain categories of service dogs.

DMH assumed there is no fiscal impact from this proposed legislation.

Officials at the **Department of Social Services (DSS)** assume section 209.150 of this proposal extends to people with a visual, aural, or "other" disability, the same rights afforded to a person with no such disability.

DSS states this proposal expands the federal definition of a service animal to include an "emotional support animal" also known as a comfort animal.

DSS assumes this proposal could lead to a larger percentage of clients and/or employees indicating they need to bring a dog into the building as an accommodation.

DSS assumes this proposal may lead to additional accommodation requests from other employees who have allergies to dogs, which may become more difficult to accommodate if there are several dogs in one building.

DSS assumes all of the definitions except "emotional support animal" refer to a dog. Given that the definition of an "emotional support animal" does not have specifics about the type of animal, staff or clients could request to bring a wide variety of animals (e.g., monkey, cat) into the building which may lead to safety and other concerns (e.g., allergic reactions).

DSS assumes employees may request a variety of accommodations if they are allergic to the animal such as moving cubicles, purchase of air purifiers and masks, and additional cleaning. It is anticipated that these costs would be absorbed within the current budget of DSS.

KB:LR:OD

L.R. No. 1986-01 Bill No. HB 834 Page 4 of 5 April 8, 2013

### ASSUMPTION (continued)

Officials from the **Department of Agriculture**, **Department of Corrections**, **Department of Labor and Industrial Relations**, **Department of Health and Senior Services**, and the **Office of Administration** each assume the proposal would not fiscally impact their respective agencies.

**Oversight** assumes there is no direct fiscal impact from this proposed legislation on state or local government funds.

FISCAL IMPACT - State Government	FY 2014 (10 Mo.)	FY 2015	FY 2016
	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>
FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government	FY 2014 (10 Mo.)	FY 2015	FY 2016
	<u><b>\$0</b></u>	<u><b>\$0</b></u>	<u>\$0</u>

#### FISCAL IMPACT - Small Business

No direct fiscal impact to small businesses would be expected as a result of this proposal.

#### FISCAL DESCRIPTION

The proposed legislation appears to have no direct fiscal impact.

This legislation is not federally mandated, would not duplicate any other program and would not require additional capital improvements or rental space.

L.R. No. 1986-01 Bill No. HB 834 Page 5 of 5 April 8, 2013

## **SOURCES OF INFORMATION**

Department of Mental Health
Department of Social Services
Department of Agriculture
Department of Corrections
Department of Labor and Industrial Relations
Department of Health and Senior Services
Office of Administration

Ross Strope Acting Director April 8, 2013

Con Ada